

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claim 24 has been allowed. Claims 1, 6, 16 and 20 have been amended.

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested Applicant fill in the blank for the application number referred to in paragraph 30 of the specification. Paragraph 30 has been amended as requested by the Examiner.

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner because Figs. 1A-1C should be designated with the legend "Prior Art". Submitted herewith is a corrected version of Figs. 1A-1C, properly labeled as prior art. Applicant believes this submission is fully responsive to the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the term "propeller connector" in independent claim 20 lacks antecedent basis. Claim 20 has been amended to correct this inadvertent error by properly referring to the propeller protector instead of propeller connector. This amendment is supported, for example, at Fig. 3 of the application, which shows propeller protector 137 connected to wing support structure 134, 136, 138 by a plurality of struts 135. Applicant believes this amendment is fully responsive to the Examiner's concerns.

Claims 1-5 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,550,715 (Reynolds). Regarding independent claim 1, this claim has been amended to recite that the wing and the propeller are located proximal to a first end of the frame, and the stabilizer is proximal to a second end of the frame remote from the first end. These amendments are supported, for example, by Fig. 2 of the present application, which shows stabilizers 145 mounted at a rear end of frame 140, and wing 120 and propeller 200 mounted at a

front end of frame 140. See also the accompanying description at paragraphs 018 and 019 of the application. Reynolds does not disclose this arrangement, since its wing and stabilizer 24A-C are all at the same end of its frame 14, and its propeller 22 is at an opposite end remote from the wing.

Thus, claim 1 is not anticipated by Reynolds, because this reference does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, and it would not have been obvious to modify Reynolds' aircraft to yield the invention of amended claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 is patentable, as are claims 2-5 and 15, which depend from claim 1.

Claim 6-14 and 16-19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6 and 16 have been rewritten in independent form to render claims 6-14 and 16-19 allowable.

Claim 20-23 were also indicated as being allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under § 112, second paragraph. These claims are allowable, since claim 20 has been amended, as set forth herein, to overcome the rejection under §112.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

Application No.: 10/825,214

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Michael A. Messina

Registration No. 33,424

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MAM:llg
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 28, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**